UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/796,702	03/09/2004	Johann F. Petersen	58999US003	2885	
	7590 06/14/201 IVE PROPERTIES CO	EXAMINER			
PO BOX 33427		WOLLSCHLAGER, JEFFREY MICHAEL			
ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1791		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/14/2010	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

LegalUSDocketing@mmm.com LegalDocketing@mmm.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/796,702	PETERSEN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
JEFFREY WOLLSCHLAGER	1791		

	JEFFREY WOLLSCHLAGER	1791	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>24 May 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any externation Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water MAMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I  (a) They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
<ul> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo</li> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or</li> </ul>	**	ducing or simplifying tl	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
<ul><li>4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li><li>5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li></ul>		mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	·	•	_
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-3,7,11,16,17,19-23,25-27 and 34-51. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e:	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Jeff Wollschlager/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1791	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's argument primarily asserts that since the combination does not employ the same claimed materials in the same claimed manner that it does not follow that the basis weight of the combined materials would be less than 100 gsm. As an initial matter, the examiner submits that one having ordinary skill would have readily understood the general ranges of the basis weight of the nonwoven material of Jackson (e.g. col. 2, lines 12-15). Applicant argues though that since Jackson also employs filaments in addition to such a conventional nonwoven material and that such filaments increase the basis weight, possibly significantly, that the rejection can not be maintained. This argument is not persuasive. The examiner submits that the increase in basis weight can be determined from the disclosure of Jackson. Using values from the preferred embodiments of Jackson (e.g. spacing of 5 mm; 50 filamanets; 2 denier; and a 3 to 1 stretching) it follows that the increase attributed to the stretched product due to the inclusion of the extra filaments would be less than 1 gsm. Again it is noted that this less than 1 gsm is calculated from values within the preferred embodiment of Jackson and not from the fully disclosed ranges of applicable filament usage. The examiner submits that the claims would need to be amended to overcome the rejection .